



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Chandigarh Administration Gazette

Published by Authority

NO. 093] CHANDIGARH, MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 2023 (SRAVANA 23, 1945 SAKA)

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Notification

The 7th August, 2023

No. 13/1/9996-HII(2)-2023/11387.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 50/2022 dated 13.05.2023 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

SOBHAN KUMAR SINGH @ SOHAN SINGH, S/O SHEO LAKHAN SINGH,
R/O HOUSE NO.192, NEAR POST OFFICE HALLOMAJRA, CHANDIGARH (Workman)

AND

KHANNA ENTERPRISES (THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR/OWNER/PARTNER/PROPRIETOR),
ADDRESS; PLOT NO.3118, INDUSTRIAL AREA, PHASE 2, CHANDIGARH ((Management)

AWARD

1. Sobhan Kumar Singh @ Sohan Singh, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*hereinafter in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that on 15.04.2014 the workman was appointed by the management as Welder. He is a 'workman' defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act. Daily timing of the workman was from 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. with weekly off. The work of the workman was controlled, supervised and assessed by the management. The personal file, records of leave etc. of the workman was maintained by the management. The workman was being paid monthly wages @ ₹ 11,200/- in cash and ESI contribution under labour welfare scheme had not been provided by the management to the workman. In mid July 2021 the workman informed the co-owner of the Khanna Enterprises namely Sh. Prabhjeet Singh for one month leave till mid August 2021 due emergency occurred at his village and the co-worker approved the same. There is no procedure for applying for leave in writing nor any leave form is provided by the management. Oral

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed by
Jalinder Kumar
Date: 2023.08.14
15:13:36 IST
Reason: I am the author
Location:

(1491)

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :
<https://egazette.chd.gov.in>

information with regard to leave is sufficient and the management deducts the wages of leave period from the monthly wages. On his return, i.e. on 17.08.2021, the workman went to his work place and informed to the co-owner Shri Prabhjeet Singh regarding continuing services. Then, Shri Prabhjeet Singh told the workman that his services were terminated. Hence, the services of the workman were terminated abruptly and illegally without following any procedure of law. Work & conduct of the workman while in service was unblemished and satisfactory. Neither any notice / charge sheet was served to the workman nor was any inquiry conducted against the workman for any misconduct during his whole service tenure. While terminating the services of the workman, the management has not paid full & final settlement payment including notice pay, retrenchment compensation, gratuity, leave encashment, bonus of last two financial years and paid leave. The work on which the workman was deputed is still going on as the work is regular work of industry / establishment of the management. While terminating the services of the workman, the management has utterly violated the various provisions of the ID Act. Neither any prior notice was issued to the workman nor he was paid wages in lieu of the notice period. The workman has completed 240 days in 12 calendar months preceding his termination. The workman has submitted demand notice to the management and also submitted copies of the same before the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, Chandigarh, who initiated conciliation proceedings but the same failed. Hence, present claim. Verbal termination order is illegal, unjustified, malafide and violation of all other provisions of the ID Act so the workman is fully entitled for reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service. It is prayed that the termination may kindly be declared illegal and the workman be reinstated into service with continuity of service, with full back wages and all other applicable consequential benefits.

3. On notice, the management appeared through its authorized representative and contested the claim of the workman by filing written statement on 10.03.2023, wherein preliminary objections are raised on the ground that the claim statement is totally false and frivolous and liable to be dismissed as the workman never worked with the management as alleged by him nor the management has any concern with the workman. The workman has not attached any documents or proof to get strengthen his claim as such the present claim statement is liable to be dismissed. The claim statement filed by the workman is hopelessly time barred and is liable to be dismissed being time barred. The workman has not approached this Court with clean hands and has concealed the material facts from this Court.

4. On merits, it is stated that the workman never worked with the management as such there is no question of paying any salary, as alleged. There is no relationship of workman and management between the parties. False and frivolous story has been made just to extract money from the management. The workman is not entitled for any relief. Averments of the claim statement are denied. It is prayed that claim may be dismissed with costs.

5. The workman filed rejoinder, wherein the contents of written statement are denied and the averments of the statement of claim are reiterated.

6. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 10.05.2023 :—

1. Whether the termination of the workman is illegal ? OPW
2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, whether the workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service, full back wages and all other consequential benefits along with interest, as prayed for ? OPW
3. Whether claim statement is time barred ? OPM
4. Relief.

7. On joint request of the parties, case taken before National Lok Adalat on 13.05.2023, wherein the workman got recorded his statement, which is reproduced as below :—

"Stated that at this stage I do not want to pursue my present industrial dispute on the technical grounds with a liberty to file a fresh one. My present industrial dispute may kindly be disposed off accordingly in the Lok Adalat."

His statement is countersigned by his Representative.

8. Heard. In view of the aforesaid statement, the present industrial dispute is disposed off being not pressed for with a liberty to file a fresh one, as prayed for. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

The 13.05.2023.

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory, Chandigarh.
UID No. PB0152.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Notification

The 7th August, 2023

No. 13/1/9999-HII(2)-2023/11389.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 64/2018 dated 29.05.2023 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

SEEMA, H.NO.1249, HALLO MAJRA, CHANDIGARH. (Workman)

AND

M/S GREEN ASIA FACILITIES PVT. LTD., PLOT NO. 178-178A, ELANTE MALL
INDUSTRIAL AREA, PHASE-I, CHANDIGARH. (Management)

AWARD

1. Seema, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that the workman was appointed as Security Guard on 10.04.2012. She remained in the un-interrupted employment of the management up to 14.03.2016 when her services were illegally & wrongly terminated by refusing work. The workman was drawing ₹12,000/- per month as wages for 12 hours duties, which were less than the minimum rate of wages applicable to the management. On 15.04.2016 the workman went to attend her normal duty but she was refused work by the management without assigning any reason and notice. Refusal of work, which amounts to termination, is retrenchment under Section 2(oo) of the ID Act. The management has also violated Section 25-F of the ID Act. No charge sheet was issued, no inquiry was held and the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation at the time of termination. Juniors to the workman were retained in service when the services of the workman were terminated. The management has violated Section 25-G of the ID Act. The violation of the same makes the termination void. For her reinstatement the workman served upon the management a demand notice dated 16.08.2016. The management did not reply the demand notice and also did not take the workman back on duty. The Conciliation Officer, U.T. Chandigarh was requested for his intervention. The management

also refuses to take the workman back on duty before the Conciliation Officer. The action of the management in terminating the services of the workman is illegal, wrong, motivated, against the principles of natural justice and unfair labour practice. Prayer is made that the workman may be reinstated with continuity of service and with full back wages as the workman remained unemployed during the period i.e. from the date of termination to till date.

3. On notice, the management appeared through its representative Shri Hem Raj and contested the claim of the workman by filing written statement on 26.09.2018, wherein it is stated that the workman had worked with the management from 01.04.2013 to 31.01.2016 as Security Guard. The workman was drawing ₹14,227/- per month as wages including PF and ESI benefit. The workman served a demand notice dated 16.08.2016 and in this respect the management had attended all hearing but no amicable settlement could be made possible. On 11.11.2016 the workman came in the office and had taken her full & final settlement amount from accounts department. Claim of the workman is totally false and not based on facts. Prayer is made that claim of the workman may be dismissed.

4. The workman filed rejoinder, wherein the contents of written statement are denied as wrong except the admitted facts of the claim and the averments of the statement of claim are reiterated.

5. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 04.12.2018 :—

1. Whether the services of the workman were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief she is entitled to, if any ? OPW
2. Relief.

6. In evidence, the workman examined herself as AW1 and tendered into evidence her affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A'. Thereafter case remained pending for cross-examination of AW1. Despite availing repeated about 31 effective opportunities including repeated last opportunities the workman failed to appear for her cross-examination and to conclude evidence. On 29.05.2023 due to non-appearance the workman is proceeded against *ex parte*.

7. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management closed the evidence without adducing any evidence.

8. I have heard the Learned Representative for the management and have gone through the file carefully. My findings on the issues framed in this case are as follows :—

Issue No. 1 :

9. Onus to prove this issue was on the workman.

10. The workman, who tendered her affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' in her examination-in-chief, did not appear and present herself for cross-examination. Testimony of AW1 being incomplete cannot be read into evidence. No other oral or documentary evidence is adduced by the workman. Besides, the workman was proceeded against *ex parte*. Consequently, the workman has failed to prove that her services were terminated illegally by the management.

11. Accordingly, this issue is decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

Relief :-

12. In the view of foregoing finding on the issue above, this industrial dispute is declined. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

The 29.05.2023.

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory, Chandigarh.
UID No. PB0152.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Notification

The 7th August, 2023

No. 13/1/9992-HII(2)-2023/11391.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 2/2022 dated 13.05.2023 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

KULVINDER SINGH - FIELD EXECUTIVE, AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS S/O LAJA SINGH,
R/O VILLAGE TIRA, P.O. TIRA, TEHSIL KHARAR, DISTRICT SAS NAGAR MOHALI,
PUNJAB (Workman)

AND

(1) INFOMAX MANAGEMENT SERVICES PVT. LTD., SCO NO. 186-188, 3rd FLOOR,
CABIN NO.6, SECTOR 17, CHANDIGARH THROUGH ITS BRANCH MANGER MANOJ
CHAMOLI, MOBILE NO.9876035972

(2) INFOMAX MANAGEMENT SERVICES PVT. LTD., HEAD OFFICE 4E, 16, 17,
TYPE 4, BLOCK B, JHANDEWAL EXTENSION, HANDEWLA, NEW DELHI -110055 THROUGH ITS
DIRECTOR SANJEEV SARIN, MOBILE NO. 9811012879. (Management)

AWARD

1. Kulvinder Singh, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*hereinafter in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that the workman was working with the management as Field Executive at Chandigarh office. He joined in the year 2009. Since then the workman was working with the management without any break. The salary of the workman working as Field Executive is ₹ 10,500/- per month plus the amount of PF deposited in his PF account plus conveyance charges. The workman was initially receiving the salary through cheque and later on the same is deposited in his account. During the entire tenure of service with the management there was no complaint against the workman and there was no complaint from any customer against him. Work & conduct of the workman was up to mark. Job profile of the workman was to collect the cheques from the field (customers of the management) and handover to persons authorised by the management. On 18.08.2020 the workman and other similar situated persons came to their work place but the Branch Manager Sh. Manoj Chamoli, Chandigarh Branch did not allow them to join their respective duties. Even the Branch Manager did not pay any heed to the request of the workman to join duty and told the workman that his services are no longer required without assigning any reason. Action of the Branch Manager Manoj Chamoli terminating the services of the workman without any charge-sheet, inquiry and without advance notice and compensation, is illegal, unlawful and wrongful. The workman along with other terminated persons filed a complaint dated 17.08.2020 against the Branch Manager Manoj Chamoli before the police authorities and during proceedings therein the Branch Manager admitted his fault regarding illegal termination / retrenchment of the workman and given an undertaking dated

25.08.2020 wherein he mentioned that he will allow the workman and other similar persons, whose services were terminated, and can join their respective duties from 26.08.2020. On 26.08.2020 when the workman and other similar situated persons came to join their duties found that the Branch Manager has locked the office and not picking their phones. Photos of the office having locked with the date of newspaper are with the workman. Thereafter the workman sent their joining report through post. Copy of the postal receipt are with the workman and further the receipts from the website of postal department showing delivery of the letters are also with the workman. The workman also sent a demand notice to the management to accept his claim but the same is in vain. The workman has completed 240 days service with the management therefore the management has not complied with the provision of Section 25-F of the ID Act. The management retained some fresh hand in service or also got done work from competitive agency employees so the action is against the principles of natural justice. The management has not complied with the provisions of the ID Act. The management has illegally terminated the services of the workman w.e.f. 18.08.2020. The management has not issued any advance notice to the workman, never paid compensation, never conducted any inquiry and issued any charge sheet at the time of termination of the workman. Even no personal hearing was given to the workman at the time of termination. The management with *malafide* intention to cover their own act issued notices with regard to strike held by the workman. Those notices are afterthought act of the management and on that particular date the workman was on duty and in this regard he has sufficient proof. The management has violated the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-H of the ID Act. The workman is unemployed after termination and is not gainfully employed anywhere though he has tried his best. Prayer is made that the services of the workman be reinstated with continuity of service, full back wages from the date of his termination and with all consequential benefits.

3. On notice, the management appeared through its authorized representative and contested the claim of the workman by filing joint written statement on 20.07.2022, wherein preliminary objections are raised on the ground that the present industrial dispute has been raised against the wrong name of the management. The complete and correct name of the management is 'M/s Infomax Management Services (India) Pvt. Ltd. and not 'M/s Infomax Management Services Pvt. Ltd. Since the present industrial dispute has been raised against the wrong / incomplete name of management so the present industrial dispute of the workman is strictly liable to be dismissed. The workman has not approached this Court with clean hands and opted to hide some key relevant facts in order to achieve his ulterior motive. It is submitted that when the workman started absenting from his duties un-authorisedly w.e.f. 18.08.2020, the management sent him letters (s) dated 22.08.2020, 31.08.2020, 02.09.2020 & 15.09.2020 through speed post asking the workman thereby to resume on his duties. In reply to the demand letter of the workman, the management sent reply dated 24.09.2020 under speed post reiterating their stand that they never terminated the services of the workman and asked the workman to join back on his duties. Before the Learned Conciliation Officer / Assistant Labour Commissioner during the conciliation proceedings, the management submitted a written submission on 21.10.2020, 04.11.2020 and also moved an application on 21.12.2020 asking the workman thereby to resume back on their duties and reiterated that the management had never terminated their services rather the workman had himself started absenting from his duties un-authorisedly w.e.f. 18.08.2020. Despite all above efforts of the management, the workman kept upholding his adamant attitude and never accepted the offer of the management. Hence, the present industrial dispute of the workman is strictly liable to be dismissed in the interest and furtherance of justice. The workman is not entitled to raise the claim of reinstatement before this Court as the workman had himself refused to join back on his services before the Conciliation Officer on 05.01.2021. The said

factum also got recorded in the quasi judicial proceedings. Considering number of correspondences by the management, offer before the Learned Conciliation Officer given by the management and refusal by the workman to join back on his duties, the presumption can be very easily drawn that the workman has abandoned his services and pursuing the present claim with the sole motive to satisfy his ulterior motive and *mala fide* intention, therefore, the present industrial dispute may be dismissed in the interest of justice.

4. On merits, it is pleaded that the workman started working for the management w.e.f. 11.01.2009 as a Pick-up Boy. The workman was duly provided with the letter of appointment at the time of his recruitment by the management. The services of the workman never got illegally terminated by the management rather the workman had himself started un-authorisedly absenting from his duties w.e.f. 18.08.2020. The management extended numerous offers to the workman to join back on his duties but unfortunately to no avail. Moreover, the workman refused to join back on his duties before the Learned Conciliation Officer on 05.01.2021. The workman had always been provided with wages in accordance with the rate as declared by the concerned State Government besides other legal facilities. It is a matter of record that the workman initially received the salary through cheque and later on the same deposited in his account. It is denied that there was not even a single complaint against the workman or the conduct of the workman was up to mark. The management always opted to ignore the mistakes(s) of the workman in order to maintain cordial relation in between the employer-employee and ensure peaceful working environment in the establishment. It is a matter of record that job profile of the workman is to collect the cheques from the field (customers of the management / organisation) and handover to persons authorised by the management. However, it is submitted that due to the nature of job, the workman used to serve only from 10 A.M. to 01:00 P.M. during his ordinary course of service. It is denied that the action of the Branch Manager - Manoj Chamoli, terminating the workman without any charge sheet or inquiry or without any advance notice / compensation is illegal. It is submitted that firstly, the services of the workman were never illegally terminated by the management rather he had himself started absenting from his duties. Secondly, even otherwise the services of the workman cannot be terminated by the person below the appointing authority. It is a matter of record that the workman along with other persons filed a complaint dated 17.08.2020 against the Branch Manager Manoj Chamoli before the police authorities. However, the issue regarding illegal termination falls beyond the jurisdictional scope of police authorities. Secondly, the workman by invoking his personal contacts / relations approached one - Mr. Ajay Singh, who was then deployed at Mohali Police Station. He called the Branch Manager through his mobile Phone No.+91-9501610016 on 25.08.2020 and asked him to report at Mohali P.S. immediately. When Sh. Manoj Chamoli, Branch Manager reached the police station, he was pressurized to write such letter which neither he ever intended to nor the contents of the same bear any reality. When the management came to know about the entire incident, the management directed the Branch Manager to file a complaint narrating all true facts at Sector 17 P.S. Chandigarh. Hence, the statement obtained by the Branch Manager by exercising force and coercion does not hold any veracity in law and therefore, the same is liable to be rejected in the interest of justice. The workman never turned back on his duties after absenting un-authorisedly from his duties w.e.f. 18.08.2020. The workman never came to join his duty on 26.08.2020. The management replied to the demand notice vide letter dated 24.09.2020 and asked the workman to join back on duties immediately. It is a matter that the workman completed 240 days or not. The workman was sent number of correspondences to join back and offer to join back was also extended before the Conciliation Officer. However, when the workman refused to join back duties, the management was left with no other alternative but to get the work done by engaging fresh hands. The management has not committed violation of any of the provisions of the ID Act. Further averments made in the preliminary objections are reiterated and rest of the averments of claim

statement are denied. Payer is made that the present claim / industrial dispute of the workman does not merit any consideration and may be dismissed.

5. The workman filed replication, wherein the contents of written statement are denied as wrong except the admitted facts of the claim and the averments of the statement of claim are reiterated.

6. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 05.12.2022 :—

1. Whether the termination of the workman is illegal ? OPW
2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, whether the workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service, full back wages and all other consequential benefits ? OPW
3. Whether the workman has not approached the court with clean hands and concealed the material facts ? OPM
4. Whether the claim statement is not maintainable in the present form ? OPM
5. Relief.

7. On joint request of the parties, the case taken up in Pre-Lok Adalat on 03.05.2023, wherein the workman got recorded his statement, which is reproduced as below :

"State that I have received demand draft No. 346949 dated 01.05.2023 for a sum of ₹1,30,000/- drawn on Punjab National Bank, New Delhi - A, Block Connaught Place, (New Delhi) Delhi - 110001 towards full & final settlement of my claims including right of reinstatement. Full & final settlement receipt is Exhibit 'C1', which bears my signatures as well as thumb impression. I do not intend to further pursue my present industrial dispute being compromised. My present industrial dispute may be disposed off accordingly in the Lok Adalat."

Statement of the workman is countersigned by his Representative.

8. On 13.05.2023, case taken up in National Lok Adalat. Heard. In view of the statement of the workman recorded on 03.05.2023, this industrial dispute is disposed off as settled by way of compromise. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

The 13.05.2023.

(Sd.) . . . ,

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)
PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory, Chandigarh.

Secretary Labour,
Chandigarh Administration.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
HOME DEPARTMENT

Notification

The 13th August, 2023

No. 224466.1/1/214-HIII(1).2023/11948.—The Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh is pleased to confer Administrator's Police Medal for Distinguished/ Meritorious Services to the following twenty two (22) Chandigarh Police Personnel on the eve of Independence Day, 2023 i.e. 15.08.2023 :—

Sr. No.	Rank, Name & No.	Administrator's Police Medal for
1.	Dy. SP Gurjeet Kaur, No. 269/CHG	Distinguished Service
2.	Insp. Baldev Kumar, No. 479/CHG	Distinguished Service
3.	Insp. Ranjit Singh, No. 516/CHG	Distinguished Service
4.	ASI/LR Satyawar 931/CP	Distinguished Service
5.	ASI/LR Punjab Singh, No. 1362/CP	Distinguished Service
6.	ASI/LR Yashwant Singh No. 1438/CP	Distinguished Service
7.	HC Devi Chand, No. 976/CP	Distinguished Service
8.	Dy. SP Barjinder Singh, No. 301/CHG	Meritorious Services
9.	Insp. ORP Kehar Singh, No.1414/CHG	Meritorious Services
10.	SI Kulwinder Kaur, No. 1079/CHG	Meritorious Services
11.	SI Jagdish Chander No. 1469/CHG	Meritorious Services
12.	ASI Harjinder Singh, No. 1827/CHG	Meritorious Services
13.	ASI/LR Uttam Chand, No. 3115/CP	Meritorious Services
14.	ASI/LR Sunder Singh, No. 1661/CP	Meritorious Services
15.	ASI/LR Satish Kumar, No. 2733/CP	Meritorious Services
16.	ASI/LR Pritpal Singh, No. 3245/CP	Meritorious Services
17.	HC Parveen Kumar, No. 967/CP	Meritorious Services
18.	HC Vikash Kumar, No. 679/CP	Meritorious Services
19.	HC Dharaminder Singh, No.1212/CP	Meritorious Services
20.	L/HC Sushma Rani Mehla No. 436/CP	Meritorious Services
21.	Sr. Ct Kaushal Kaur No. 28/CP	Meritorious Services
22.	Sr. Ct Inderjit, No.79/CP	Meritorious Services

Chandigarh :
The 13th August, 2023.

NITIN KUMAR YADAV, IAS,
Home Secretary,
Chandigarh Administration.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Pallu Rawat, S/o Chandeshwar Rawat, # 5854, Sector - 56, Palsora, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Palu Raut.

[956-1]

I, Ashu, D/o Ravi Kumar, House No. 2152, DMC, Sector 38 West, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Ashu to Ashu Sharma.

[957-1]

I, Neha, W/o Ravi Kumar, House No. 2152, DMC, Sector 38 West, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Neha to Neha Sharma.

[958-1]

I, Sangeeta Negi, W/o Manoj Negi, R/o # 1542, New Indira Colony, Manimajra, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Sangeeta Devi Negi.

[959-1]

I, Daljeet kaur, D/o No. 50814 Late MCSWA-I Puran Singh Sandhu, resident of House No. 894, Sector 38-A, Chandigarh, have add my surname with name and now complete name is Daljeet kaur Sandhu vide affidavit dated 14.06.2023 before Notary Chandigarh.

[960-1]

I, Jagat Pal, S/o Ram Dular, House No. 1113, Sector 7-B, Chandigarh, have changed my minor daughter name from Manisha to Manisha Gautam.

[961-1]

I, Nirmal Rathaur, W/o Jai Ram Rathaur, R/o House No. 1520, 2nd Floor, Sector 7-C, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Nirmal Shah.

[962-1]

"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/public notices will remain solely responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc."